PROMORTALISM

GONTLEMANG GENERAL-SEGOLODI

PROMORTALISM

Copyright © 2023 Gontlemang General-Segolodi

All rights reserved.

No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording, scanning, or otherwise, without the prior written permission of the author.

CONTENTS

Introduction

CHAPTER 1

WHY THERE IS SOMETHING RATHER THAN NOTHING

CHAPTER 2

THE MORAL DELUSION

CHAPTER 3

SIMULATION THEORY

CHAPTER 4

A FINAL SOLUTION

INTRODUCTION

Promortalism is the philosophy that it is best for any mortal living being to d/ie as soon as possible. The use of the word “life” throughout this book should (unless stated otherwise) be interpreted as meaning consciousness. Consciousness refers to an awareness of one’s own existence. Promortalism is a combination of the words “pro”, meaning, to be in favor of something, and “mortalism”, which historically meant the Christian belief of a death of the soul; however, in this case, it simply refers to the quality of being a mortal. This means to be susceptible to de/ath.

Promortalism is thought to fall under the philosophy branch of ethics, where it has been debated as being either a moral good or bad. This view is mistaken because, in actual fact, the concept of morality is a complete fraud, meaning that the study of the entire branch of ethics is and has always been a total waste of time and effort. This will be explained later. Here, I will prove that since all actions are morally neutral, promortalism is a type of existentialism. It is specifically a logical course of action regarding the realization, concerning the question of why things exist and the implications. This version of promortalism (existential promortalism) that I pro/mote can thus be understood as the philosophy that it is **logical** for any mortal living being to d/ie as soon as possible. It also implies antinatalism, specifically, the version of this philosophy that is “anti”, or against, the creation of new life, or natalism, on the basis that it is **illogical**. Thus, it is existential antinatalism, which is different from ethics-focused antinatalism. The amoral nature of existential promortalism means that all methods by which life can be exter/minated are permissible and preferable are those that exter/minate the most amount of life in the shortest amount of time.

CHAPTER 1

WHY THERE IS SOMETHING RATHER THAN NOTHING

Metaphysics is the branch of philosophy that deals with the nature of existence, truth, and knowledge. The question, “Why is there something rather than nothing?” is the most fundamental in metaphysics. “Something”, in this case, does not refer to anything specific like God or humans, but rather to the absence of nothing. As it implies, the two are incompatible. This is consistent with the three basic laws of logic. Logic is the science of reasoning. The law of identity states that everything is itself and not something else, meaning that something is something and not nothing. The law of non-contradiction states that a statement cannot be both true and false simultaneously, meaning that there is either something or nothing. There cannot be both something and nothing simultaneously. Finally, the law of the excluded middle states that every statement is either true or false. There is no middle ground between true and false. The answer to this question can be found only in the concept of causation. This is the relationship between causes and effects. Nothing can begin to happen without a cause. One argument based on this premise is the possibility of an infinite regression of past events. This means that for every causal chain, there is no first cause. Every effect has a cause, of which that cause is also an effect of a prior cause and so on ad infinitum. Alternatively, there is an argument of a possible first cause. It states that there can be an uncaused first cause that can start a chain of events. It is uncaused only in the sense that it never began to exist, but rather has existed for eternity before starting the causal chain. In both arguments, the reason there is something rather than nothing is the fact that there has never been nothing. Something has always existed.

To accept these arguments, we must first prove the validity of the premise that nothing can begin to happen without a cause. If something were to be said to have come into existence without a cause, it would imply that it created itself. However, a non-existent thing cannot create anything. To be able to create something, it must first exist; however, it would then be unable to create itself since it would already exist. Note that in a true state of nothingness, there would be no abstract concepts, such as the laws of logic. This means that there would be no causal law that states that something cannot come from nothing, but there would also be no causal law that states that something can come from nothing, so something would still be unable to come from nothing. The premise is true and is obeyed by both arguments.

Events happen over time. Time is a measurement of the duration of events. Time is generally divided into past, present, and future. The past refers to time that has passed, and the present refers to the time that passes at the current moment. It is the recent past, of which it is arbitrarily decided how recent it must be. The future is a time that has yet to pass. The next necessary proof after establishing the validity of causation is that of the possibility of an infinite amount of time in the past. A potentially convincing objection one might raise is that if an infinite amount of time has to pass before it gets to the present, it would never arrive. As an analogy, imagine a car travelling on a straight road heading toward a four-way stop. Suppose that the car must travel an infinite length of road before arriving at the stop. Would it ever get there? No. An infinitely large task cannot be completed. If we accept that the past cannot be infinitely long, we are left with no choice but to assume that for every causal chain, there is a first cause that has not existed for eternity, before starting any chain of events. This cause began to exist out of nothing. The beginning of its existence would be the beginning of time, since it would be the first event that has ever happened. This is an absurd conclusion because, as we have already established, something cannot come from nothing.

Can we still ignore the apparent contradiction by passing it off as a mere paradox? No. In fact, its flaw is present in the question that it poses, which demonstrates a misunderstanding of the nature of time, as demonstrated by the argument from last effect. This argument states that time has no beginning but an end. That end is the present. In an infinite causal chain, every cause is an effect of a previous cause, while every effect is a cause of the next effect. An exception is the last event that occurred in the present, which is only ever an effect. It is an effect because it was caused by a previous event; however, there is no event that it has itself caused yet, meaning that it is not yet a cause, hence the, “argument from last effect”. Time only creates the present and the past. The head of the arrow of time is the present, while its infinitely long shaft, which is always extending, is the past. Since the present is still the past, there is technically only the past. The reason why time ends in the present and excludes a supposed infinitely long future is because, so long as we are in the present, there is no time in the future. Time is always coupled with events. There is no causation without time; thus, all causation also ends in the present. Every future event is indeed predetermined (unchangeable) because it will be an effect caused by the last effect. For it to be changeable, the last effect must be changeable as well, but it is not because it has already happened. However, this is irrelevant. Time still

ends in the present. In a causal chain, there is an order of events where one thing occurs before or after another. This implies the passage of time, much like claiming that the physical existence of an object implies the existence of space. No time, no causation. The view that the past cannot be infinitely long because of an infinitely long future assumes that there can be causation without time such that it is a pre-existing medium through which time flows. This is illogical. If we re-examine the aforementioned example, we can see that the car creates more road as it moves. There neither exists a four-way stop nor more road in front of it. Causation cannot precede time. They both end in the present.

Another objection is the claim that, while the concept of infinity might work in theory, an infinite amount of anything in reality is thought to be impossible because it would supposedly lead to contradictions. As an analogy, imagine that for every orbit that Venus completes around the sun, Earth completes two orbits. Assuming that both planets have been orbiting the Sun since eternity past, how many orbits has each one completed? The problem lies in the fact that both planets would complete the same (an infinite) number of orbits, which is a contradiction. As a second analogy, imagine a hotel with an infinite number of rooms that are all occupied by guests. All rooms are assigned a unique natural number in order from the number one. Suppose that the guests in the odd-numbered rooms were to check out. How many rooms would remain vacant? In a second scenario, imagine that the guests in the rooms numbered two and above check out. How many rooms would remain vacant now? The problem lies in the fact that for the first scenario, subtracting two infinities results in infinity, whereas for the second scenario, subtracting two infinities results in a finite value, meaning that both results contradict each other. However, these objections are flawed because they show a misunderstanding of the concept of infinity. They treat it as if it was a number, when it is not. Infinity is an adjective that means the lack of a limit. In the context of size, it relates to something being either limitlessly small or limitlessly big. Infinity cannot be used to perform mathematical calculations. Attempting to do so is illogical; hence, why it results in contradictions.

In a mathematical sense, infinity can be thought of as a question with an answer that is both incomplete and impossible to complete. It is practically the same as no answer. This is because the calculation used to obtain the answer can never be completed. This implies that such an answer is not a number, which is why infinity is not a number. Numbers can be thought of as sets. A set is a collection

of distinct entities, each satisfying specific conditions and regarded as a unit. Entities are commonly referred to as elements. A number is a set containing a specific quantity of elements of any type. Here, the element we will use is a circle. The number one is a set containing a single circle. If we add another circle, it becomes the number two. We obtain the number four if we add two more circles, the number eight when we add four more elements, and so on. The numbers below one represent sets containing incompletely drawn circles. Depending on the number, a corresponding portion of the circumference is missing. The amount is based on the size of the number compared to the number one, so the number one half is a set containing a semicircle. Adding another semi-circle (completing the circumference) creates the number one. Adding another semicircle creates the number one and a half. The number zero is usually represented by an empty set. However, since a set is supposed to be a **collection** of elements, by definition it should contain something. In reality, there is no such thing as an, “empty” set, meaning that since zero represents nothing, it is not a number due to its lack of elements. It also proves that there is no such thing as “negative” numbers. These are meant to be numbers less than zero; however, their existence is illogical because something cannot be less than nothing. In mathematics, infinity is described as a number larger than any other. The opposite of infinity is a number that is smaller than any other. Another type of number that is similar to infinity, is a non-terminating decimal number. It is described as a decimal number with an infinite number of numbers behind the decimal point, such as pi. Infinity, opposite infinity, non-terminating decimals, negative numbers, and zero are not numbers because they do not possess the three properties that numbers should have.

First, all numbers can be derived through the addition or subtraction of other numbers, but the calculation has to stop at some point. In other words, they can be the final answer in a calculation. We can pick any number as our starting point, but each one has its own specific end point in the calculation to get the desired number. The calculation ends when the set representing a number contains the **entire** amount of elements it is defined as having. Any more or any less, and it is no longer the same number. Two can be described as five minus three. This is the subtraction of three circles from the set representing the number five. It can also be, one plus one, the addition of a circle to the set representing the number one. If we try to derive infinity from the number one, for instance, we can add one circle to the set. That would make it two, so we should add another circle, but that would make it three, requiring us to

continuously add one more circle without stopping. If we stop, we would end up with a different number, but it would not be infinity, since infinity is supposed to be larger than any number. The addition of circles must continue, and it must continue forever. This means that it is impossible to add **all** the circles, so rather than being a number, it is, in this case, just an endless, repeating addition of the number one starting from the number one. Opposite infinity can be derived from the calculation, with a tenth raised to the power of infinity. We are multiplying a tenth by itself forever, without stopping, for if we stop, we will end up with the wrong answer. It is also an endless process of multiplication, rather than a number. An example of a non-terminating decimal number is the answer from the division of one by three. First, let us analyze a terminating decimal number, such as the answer from the division of one by four. Imagine a white square representing the value of one. We can cut it into ten smaller squares of equal size, all of which represent the value of a tenth. Imagine four sets to which these smaller squares will move. One of the smaller squares is moved to the first set, then a second smaller square is moved to the second set, and so on. The sets should have an equal number of smaller squares. Once we are left with only two smaller squares, we can cut each into ten smaller black squares. Each black square represents the value of a hundredth. All the twenty black squares are distributed equally among the sets, so that each set gets five of them. At this point, the division is complete because no part of the original square that represented the value of one, has not been added into a set and each set contains the same total value of white and black squares, that is, a quarter. When we divide one by three, we can start with one white square representing the value of one and three sets. We can cut the square into ten equal-sized, smaller squares, each representing the value of a tenth. We then begin the distribution as before. A pattern emerges. There will always be one leftover, smaller square that, when further cut into ten smaller, equal-sized squares, still results in one leftover smaller square after distribution. This means that for the original square that represents a value of one, there will always be a small amount of it that is excluded from all three sets. Whatever answer we have is never a final answer. What we have instead, is an ongoing calculation that will never be completed. Negative numbers are inherently illogical; therefore, they cannot be derived from logical calculations. Calculations that try to derive zero end up with no answer. As an example, one minus one equals zero. The words “one” and “zero” are only substitutes for sets. If we replace them with sets, we end up with a set containing a single circle minus a set containing a single circle. Zero cannot be

represented with a set, so behind the equal sign is only a blank space, meaning that there is no answer.

The second property is the ability to participate in calculations that give a final answer. It was demonstrated in the first property that numbers are themselves derived from calculations involving other numbers. A calculation must be completed for its answer to be used in a new calculation. The answer two, which can be derived from the question, one plus one, can be added to three in a new addition to give five. Infinity, opposite infinity, and non-terminating decimal numbers are themselves, all calculations that cannot be completed, meaning that they cannot participate in calculations that give a final answer. Negative numbers are inherently illogical; therefore, they cannot be used in calculations to derive logical answers. Zero represents nothing; therefore, it cannot participate in calculations because a non-existent thing has no causal powers.

The third property is an exact size. If a number is a set containing the **total** amount of its elements, this amount is its size. Any amount that is slightly less or slightly more than the true total falsifies its size, thus making it a different number. Its size can be compared to that of another number by comparing which has a larger amount of elements. We can not only know that one is larger but also exactly by how much by subtracting the two numbers. The number two has more circles in its set than the number one. It specifically has one more circle. We know for infinity that at any given point in our calculation, it is already larger than any specific number, since we can begin to add circles to the set representing that number. However, we cannot compare the sizes of two infinities. Take, for example, the size of a set containing natural numbers compared to a set containing real numbers. Comparing their sizes requires that both sets contain the **total** amount of their elements, which is impossible. We can prove this by creating a bijection between the two sets. This is a, one-to-one, pairing of unique elements in one set to unique elements in another set. As an example, in the natural number set, we can write the number one as the first number. Then, in the real number set below the natural number set, we can write the number one again as the first number (the numbers do not have to be in order). We then pair them by drawing a straight line from the number one in the first set to the number one in the second set. We then write the number two in both sets and pair them. Then, we do the same for the number three in both sets and so on ad infinitum. Every new real number, even if it is a decimal number, can be paired with a new natural number. This means that we cannot claim that

one type of infinity is larger than another. We know that opposite infinity is smaller than any number that is a tenth raised to the power of the variable x, where x is a finite number. We also know that for a non-terminating decimal number, at any given point in our calculation, it can never be smaller or larger than specific numbers. For example, the value of pi can never be smaller than two and never be larger than four. However, for infinity, opposite infinity, and non-terminating decimal numbers, the set cannot contain a total amount of elements, so their exact sizes and the exact difference of their sizes compared to the sizes of other numbers, are both unknown and unknowable. Negative numbers are thought to be smaller than nothing, which makes no sense. Zero represents nothing; therefore, it has no size because a non-existent thing has no properties.

We can now address the aforementioned thought experiments, which are supposed proofs of the impossibility of an actual infinity. The claim that both planets complete the same number of orbits is insane. Infinity is not a number and we cannot compare the sizes of two infinities because we do not and cannot know the exact size of either one. The claim that a hotel with infinitely many rooms can have **all** rooms occupied is insane. This implies that you can have a set containing the entirety of rooms and one containing the entirety of guests even though neither is possible. The claims that infinity minus infinity equals infinity and infinity minus infinity equals one are both insane. Infinity cannot be used to perform calculations that give a final answer.

All the presented evidence further validates the aforementioned argument from the last effect. However, it has a flaw because the past cannot exist in its entirety. The only part of the past that exists at any given moment is the last effect. To demonstrate this, consider the following example. Imagine a ball that is held at a distance of x from the ground. It is then let go, so that it begins to fall down. Imagine that once the ball has travelled a distance that is half of x, time stops, leaving the ball suspended in mid-air. This moment, when the ball is at the midpoint of x, is the last effect. All moments before this one, of which there are infinitely many, do not exist. The last effect is the only moment in the past that actually exists and is completely frozen, like a photograph. It is incapable of allowing motion or change. This is the true nature of time.

This reaffirms the answer to our question. Something must have come from something because the alternative (something coming from nothing) is impossible. The reason why there is something rather than nothing is that

something has always existed.

CHAPTER 2

THE MORAL DELUSION

Morality is the differentiation of intentions, decisions, and actions between those that are distinguished as proper (right) and improper (wrong). It can be a body of standards or principles derived from a code of conduct from a particular philosophy, religion, or culture, or it can be derived from a standard that a person believes should be universal. All morality is fictitious, regardless of its origin. The idea that it can be objective is flawed. The flaw is found in its vague definition, when it states that there are actions that are “wrong”. The implication that there can exist actions that are physically possible but should never be performed, contradicts the fact of determinism, for which causation would be impossible without. The future is predetermined, meaning that everything that happens is literally **supposed** to happen. If what is supposed to happen does not happen, this would lead to a contradiction that threatens the very existence of reality. The existence of anything requires that there be no contradictions in the laws that govern reality (laws of physics); for example, a reality where one plus

one equals three cannot exist. The only “objectively” improper actions are those that contradict these laws, for example, flying like a movie superhero. They cannot be carried out because they lead to contradictions. This means that evil does not and cannot objectively exist. Its opposite, “good”, only exists if evil exists, as they reference each other. For example, if everyone is the same height, there can be no distinction between “tall” and “short” people. Morality does not exist. We are only capable of doing that which is possible and must be done.

By studying reality, we can notice patterns or similarities, and from these, we can group things into classifications. We can study the behavior of living organisms and determine all the possible ways in which they can act. However, if we do not have complete knowledge of future events (since they are predetermined), we cannot, from this, make certain claims about how they should or should not act, compared to other hypothetically possible ways that they could also act in specific situations, as these would be non-sequitur arguments. This means an argument that does not logically follow from a premise. This is the is-ought problem. There should be a logical connection between how the world **is** and how we supposedly **ought** to act and **ought** not to act. There are two types of things that exist. Necessary things, meaning the things that exist as uncaused causes, and dependent things, meaning the things that are caused by other things. Necessary things must exist for there to be something rather than nothing. These are the laws that govern reality. They are the laws of physics. Their foundation is in mathematics, which itself has its foundation in logic. They ensure that reality behaves logically; otherwise, it would, not exist. A moral system cannot be both subjective and true because it defies the law of non-contradiction. It is illogical that there could be multiple opposing moral judgments of an act that are nevertheless, supposedly, all correct. The word “subjective”, under any context, is synonymous with “fictitious”, thus any concept that is said to be subjective is not worth taking seriously at all since it is no different in its nature compared to concepts such as Santa Claus or unicorns. It must be objective, and the only way it can be so is if it solves the is-ought problem. This is the case, regardless of where the moral code comes from, be it from God or a culture. As mentioned earlier, the is-ought problem can only be solved by having access to completely accurate knowledge of future events. For example, if one could predict the future perfectly, they could observe two cars that are currently moving on the road in opposite directions and know for certain that they will crash into each other. That person would be in a position where they can describe the way the world currently is

(the bad weather, the poor condition of the road, low visibility, drunk driving and so on) and from that, they can make claims about how it soon ought to be (the two cars should crash into each other). The solution to the is-ought problem can thus only be found in determinism.

Moral realists try to save their ill-formed concept of morality by basing moral claims on moral premises. Rather than trying to derive an “ought” from an “is”, they try to derive an “ought” from another “ought”. As an example, consider the premise that causing harm to a living organism is bad. It logically follows that we ought to avoid the act of mu/rder because it is an infliction of harm. However, it should be noted that the word “bad” is not used in a neutral sense, but instead implies that something **ought** to be deemed unacceptable. This begs the question of why that thing ought to be deemed unacceptable. It is the same as claiming that something is “good”. This implies that this thing ought to be deemed acceptable. Why? This is the ought-ought problem. Whereas for deriving “ought” statements from “is” statements, the flaw lies in the conclusions, the flaw in deriving “ought” statements from “ought” statements, lies in the premises. Moral claims, like logical arguments, can only be true if their premises are true. Moral premises are different from logical premises in that, they cannot be verified by observable facts. For example, the statement “John is a man” can be a logical premise and can be verified as true without any doubt. In contrast, while the existence of pain is an observable fact, the existence of either its supposed badness or goodness is not. Moral premises can only be justified on the basis of their own moral premises. However, the new moral premises also need to be justified with their own moral premises and so on, ad infinitum. Take, for example, the premise that tor/turing a living person is bad. Why is it bad? It damages the body and causes pain, both of which are bad. Why are they bad? Nobody likes it. Anything that people generally do not like is bad. Why do people’s feelings matter? We cannot trust each other if we are constantly paranoid about being harmed by others. Trust is good. Why is trust good? It makes it easier for us to work together to build a functioning society, which is good. Why should we have a functioning society? It makes our lives easier. This is good. What is wrong with a difficult life? It is harder to survive, which may lead to our extinction, which is bad. What is wrong with going extinct? As you can see, we can always demand evidence for the supposed badness or goodness of every new premise because the “ought” of a moral premise can **never** be proven by any observable fact nor can it ever be self-evident. This leads to an infinite regress of moral premises, of which there can

never be a final one. Before the moral claim can be verified as true, the validity of infinite premises must be verified first. This means that the validity of the moral claim is unverifiable. The justification can only end in an infinite regress and not in a circular argument. This is because justifying a moral claim means treating the action or thing referenced by the claim as a cause and stating its effects, which supposedly must or must not occur. A circular argument is invalid because a moral claim cannot be its own justification. The infinite regress can only be avoided by grounding “ought” statements in “is” statements; however, taking this route leads us back to determinism. Subjective morality is invalid because it is also based on the ought-ought fallacy. As stated before, it is even worse because the moral premise is based on personal preferences.

In this paragraph, I provide a deeper analysis of the impossibility of valid moral claims, specifically with regard to the issue of pain and suffering, which are both generally considered to be “bad” things. The problem with thinking that pain and suffering are bad is that it is an appeal to emotion, which is a logical fallacy. This invalidates the position. Pain and suffering are inseparable from negative emotions. If, for example, someone is living in abject poverty but is a Buddhist and as such has no interest in material possessions, they might resent the idea of being wealthy and be perfectly happy with their simple life. It would thus make no sense to claim that because this person is poor, they are suffering, even though they are happy with their life. Suffering is a person’s circumstances that specifically cause them to feel negative emotions. Pain is synonymous with suffering, even when used in the context of physical pain, in which a physical sensation is disliked. When you dislike something, it means that you hate it, and hate is an emotion. Pain and suffering are simply unpleasant emotions. We can prove this with another example. If I had a piece of paper, would it be wrong for me to set it on fire? Morality is not generally thought to apply to non-living objects; therefore, this act would generally be considered amoral. Now, imagine that God, creates a fresh, non-living human body. If God sets it on fi/re, is that wrong? Following the previous logic, the answer is no, considering that the body is non-living, just like the paper. Now imagine that God makes another body, but this one is alive. It is a fully conscious, perfectly healthy, newborn baby. If God sets this baby on fi/re, is that wrong? They will experience pain (emotional and physical) and destruction of their body, potentially leading to death. Any moral system that deems these effects to be bad would deem this action to be wrong. However, this moral rule needs to be proven beyond all doubt. There is no doubt that they will have these experiences, but there needs to be proof of their

supposed badness for the act to deserve condemnation and perhaps, punishment. In this specific case, there are two effects on the body. First, it senses high temperature. Second, it is getting severely damaged. To analyze each effect, we must imagine two people who are on fi/re. One can feel the heat, but their body is indestructible, while the other has congenital insensitivity to pain. This is a condition that causes a person not to feel pain. They would still get bu/rned, but they would feel nothing. It would be perceived that for the second person, though they cannot feel pain, the dam/age to their body is still wrong, but how so? The paper that was burned earlier also got damaged and it also felt nothing. This opinion is simply an emotional preference. This is proven by the fact that some people enjoy self-ha/rm, for example, those who experience sexual masochism and body integrity dysphoria. When people cut their hair and nails, this is also a form of body mut/ilation, but it is generally not considered bad, precisely because it is painless. In the case of the other person who feels the heat but does not burn, it would be assumed that subjecting him to the immense heat of the fire is still wrong; however, this too is exposed as simply a matter of emotional preference. What is the inherent badness of temperature? It is just sensory data from the environment, similar to other sensory data (light, odour, sound, taste and texture). If your body can sense all temperatures without getting damaged, that would just make you a thermometer. You would, in fact, be the greatest thermometer in the universe. The temperatures that cause people to feel pain are those that they simply do not like. People have different emotion-based temperature preferences. Some like the cold of winter and others prefer the heat of summer. The same is true for all other stimuli. People have different emotion-based preferences for food (taste), beauty (sight), music (auditory), and others. We can thus conclude that bu/rning a baby alive is no more evil than burning a piece of paper, if pain and suffering are the basis for moral rules. Physical pain is just emotional pain that is triggered by physical stimuli; therefore, it is invalid as a basis for moral rules because it is an appeal to emotion.

The concept of morality is meaningless due to the complete non-existence of a widely accepted, sensible definition of the words “right” and “wrong”. Morals are meant to be rules that dictate acceptable behavior, and as such, we need a sensible reason to follow them. They cannot be followed simply for their own sake. They must have a self-evident justification, which, as we have seen, is impossible. Divine command theory states that an action is right if God has declared that it is right. If “God” does not mean the laws that govern reality, this is special pleading. This view that God’s personal opinion of the meaning of

right and wrong is “divine” and as such, free from criticism, is insane. Without the laws that govern reality, there cannot exist anything. God cannot be the one who created them, for they would have to exist first to make God’s existence possible, by which time it is too late for God to try to create them. It is as futile as a child trying to create its own parents. A possible counterargument to this is the claim that God can create logic if God is omnipotent. This means that God can do anything. This argument is flawed because of the word “anything”. All imaginable actions can be divided into two groups: logical actions and illogical actions. Saying that God can do anything implies that God can do illogical things. In this way, saying that God can defy logic because God can do anything is not a valid answer. It is the same as saying that God can defy logic because God can. The argument is not answering the question, but simply repeats the premise without evidence. Claims made without evidence can be dismissed without evidence.

Logic exists out of necessity, while God, who cannot be omnipotent, is dependent like us, and as such, God’s moral rules would be as made up as ours. The concept of, “justice” is a product of morality. It is the concept that individuals are to be treated in a fair manner, whereby they should receive what they deserve. This is either a reward for good behavior or a punishment for bad behavior. The problem is that our notion of justice is centered on the idea of self-responsibility. This is the state or fact of being answerable or accountable for something within one’s power, control, or management. For example, if someone commits ra/pe, they are generally given a prison or de/ath sentence. This idea is, of course, flawed because no one is ever solely responsible for their actions. Determinism tells us that when a person either commits a crime or becomes a victim of a crime, this is their fate. All events in their life, from conception to the occurrence of the crime, were predetermined. If we want to punish the people responsible for a crime, it is illogical to pun/ish only those who directly carried out the act. We must also punish all accomplices. Determinism shows that an off/ender’s accomplices are all those who have participated, either directly or indirectly, in events in the their life before the crime. Examples include anyone the off/ender has ever communicated with, anyone the offender has ever thought about, anyone whose creation (invention, product, service, language, culture, belief, policy, rule, ideology, idea and more) the offender has ever used or been influenced by, the parents who made the offender and so on. Accomplices also include anyone directly or indirectly involved in events in the victim’s life before the crime. However, it should be

noted that, of the countless accomplices, the most gui/lty are those whose actions are butterfly effects. Everything that happens can be traced back to something they did. In this case, the births of both the victim and the offender are the catalysts that begin the chain of events leading up to the crime. Among the accomplices, the parents of both the victim and the offender deserve the worst pun/ishments. Because the parents of victims and offenders should be seen as off/enders, anyone directly or indirectly involved in events in their lives is their accomp/lice. The most gui/lty ones are the parents of those parents. Anyone who is directly or indirectly involved in events in the lives of both the victim's and offender's grandparents and ancestors (who themselves are off/enders) is also gui/lty and should be pun/ished if they are still alive.

Another incoherent aspect of current moral realism is anthropic bias. Anthropic bias is a moral verdict that differs from another, where each pertains to an action that is very similar to the other, such that both verdicts should in fact be the same, because the difference in the actions is irrelevant. It is an anthropic bias in the sense that the difference in the verdict is usually intended to benefit humans over non-human organisms. The source of this is the flawed classification of objects by moral realists. Objects are classified into four categories, namely, non-living, non-conscious living, humans, and non-human organisms, whereby the concept of morality applies only to humans and non-human organisms. The first problem with this, is the lack of a satisfactory explanation for why morality does not apply to non-living and non-conscious living objects. If the mu/rder of an innocent person is wrong, then it should be considered wrong for a river to dr/own an innocent person, or for weeds to destroy an innocent farmer's crops. The lack of conscious control over their actions is irrelevant. Likewise, if harming an innocent person is considered wrong, then it should also be considered wrong to crush an innocent rock or chop down an innocent tree. Humans and non-human organisms also have no control over their actions or the decision making and motivation that leads to those actions because of determinism. The second problem is the illogical distinction between humans and non-human organisms. If morality applies to those who can make decisions regarding their actions, this distinction should not exist. This leads to an illogical anthropic bias. Humans and non-human organisms should be under the same classification as conscious (living) things and should thus bear the same moral responsibilities and be entitled to the same just moral treatment. Any moral system that is not universal in this way is a perversion of itself. If moral rules only apply to those who are aware of their existence and true nature, that would

make them subjective and hence fictitious. Fictitious concepts only exist when we are aware of them (when we make them up in our minds). If moral rules are objective, then they have to exist independently of personal belief. They would have to be adhered to, even if one misinterprets them or is ignorant of their existence. Thus, non-human organisms are not supposed to be exempt from following moral rules and receiving punishment if they break these rules. If the mu/rder of an innocent living thing is wrong, it is wrong for predators to hunt innocent prey. If the punishment that humans are supposed to receive for mu/rder is the de/ath penalty, then a lion that ki/lls an innocent zebra should also be sentenced to de/ath. Since all objective moral rules should apply to all living things, humans should not be exempt from following moral rules with regards to their actions that affect non-human living things. If it is wrong for a human to ki/ll another one, cu/t up their body into small pieces, sto/re them in a freezer, and cons/ume them for lunch over the course of weeks, then it is wrong for a human to do the same thing to a non-human living thing. If it is fine to e/at a non-human living thing on the basis that it is cared for properly, ki/lled quickly and painlessly without its knowledge or consent, and it is fine to ki/ll for food, then by the same logic, it is fine for a human to e/at another human on the basis that they are cared for properly, ki/lled quickly and painlessly without their knowledge or consent, and it is fine to ki/ll for food. Non-human organisms are also entitled to whatever rights and privileges humans are supposedly entitled to (right to life, liberty, vote, have equal opportunities, same sex marriage and more). To not guarantee this is apartheid level discrimination. The new classification also eliminates moral paradoxes. A moral paradox is an illogical difference in moral judgement between two actions that are the same, that should, in fact, have the same moral judgement. For example, the view that ki/lling and eating a cow is fine, but doing the same to a dog is not.

Other than a bias, a moral system should be logically consistent. If it is self-contradictory, it becomes invalid. As an example, consider the fact that both attempted mu/rder and the mu/rder of an innocent person are generally considered evil. The conception of a mortal child, however, is generally considered to be a good thing, even though it is attempted mu/rder, and when the child d/ies, it becomes mu/rder. Mu/rder is any act that e/nds a life (causes de/ath). It is **not** an act that ends a life, “prematurely”. Determinism tells us that the time and place of birth and de/ath of every living thing are already set in stone. If a man d/ies in a car crash at the age of thirty, there is no hypothetical scenario in which he could have avoided the accident and continued to live until

he d/ied of natural causes in old age. His de/ath may only be considered early, in the sense that his age of de/ath was much lower than the average human lifespan, not that he d/ied sooner than he was “supposed” to. No one is ever meant to live longer than the predetermined amount of time given in their life. The conception of a mortal child is attempted mu/rder because, as long as life extension technology is not achieved, they are certain to d/ie, and the reason is that they are alive. They are alive because they were conceived by their parents. This means that when they d/ie, the fault lies with the parents. The parents made the child a mortal, which is equivalent to strapping someone to a bo/mb on a timer. When the bo/mb is yet to explode (when the child is still alive), this is attempted mu/rder, and when it explodes (when the child d/ies, regardless of the cause), this is mu/rder. If the child inherits anything considered bad from its parents (poverty, ugliness, low intelligence, disability, ageing and others), it is once again an act of ev/il by the parents. If a mortal person d/ies of natural causes, determinism can tell us the people other than the mortal person’s parents who contributed to their de/ath. As an example, if the mortal person had a habit of smoking that made them d/ie of lung cancer, those responsible are the ones who introduced them to smoking, the ones who sold them cigarettes, the ones who manufactured the cigarettes, the ones who advertised the cigarettes, the ones who produce the ingredients in the cigarettes, for example tobacco farmers, the government that legalizes cigarettes, the people who voted for that government, the people who invented cigarettes, their grandparents who made them, making it possible for their parents to make them, and so on.

The distinction between humans and non-human living things is illogical for two more reasons. First, it falsely implies that all non-human living things are the same. However, biology classifies them into vertebrates and non-vertebrates. Among vertebrates, some are warm-blooded (mammals and birds) and cold-blooded (fish, reptiles and amphibians). Among invertebrates, there are those that have jointed legs (three pairs of legs or more) and those without (worm-like and not worm-like). Each of these groups can be reduced to families and then species. Second, it also falsely implies that all humans are the same. Humans can be divided into genetic groups, namely African, Caucasian, Northeast Asian, Arctic, American, Southeast Asian, Pacific Island, and Oceanian. Within each group, there are genetically linked but distinct populations. For example, the Bantu people are different from the Nilotic people, but both are African. Genetic diversity exists within all populations. We can, for both humans and non-humans, keep reducing similarities until we remain with a classification for only

living things that have an exact resemblance in genes and physical appearance, in which case each living thing and its twins, clones, or doppelgangers (if they exist) must follow their own set of moral rules. As stated previously, a more sensible distinction is between objects that have consciousness and those that do not, whereby morality only applies to those with consciousness because they are able to decide to perform actions. If one believes that it is equally wrong for a human to ki/ll either an innocent black or innocent white person, despite the distinct bi/olo/gi/cal dif/ferences between whites and blacks, one must also conclude that it is equally wrong for a human to ki/ll an innocent ant, such that the distinct biological differences between humans and ants are also seen as irrelevant. This distinction still presents a challenge in that, even among the things that have consciousness, one must be able to tell which ones might be philosophical zombies to know whether a thing should actually follow moral rules and deserves just moral treatment. A philosophical zombie is a hypothetical being that appears physically identical to a conscious being, but does not have consciousness. They are robots with programmed behavior. Consciousness is an inherently personal experience; therefore, every conscious brain can only ever experience its own consciousness. Knowing for certain whether another thing has consciousness is thus impossible. As previously stated, conscious things do not have control over the decisions and motivations that lead to their actions. This deals a serious blow to the idea of moral responsibility, since no conscious thing is ever truly responsible for its own actions.

"All the world is a stage and all men and women, merely players. They have their exits and entrances."

William Shakespeare

As stated in the previous chapter, there is only the past and the future. The "present" is a term used to refer to the recent past. It could have been five seconds ago or five milliseconds ago, but no matter how recent, it is still the past. Events have either happened or they have not. There is no excluded middle. You cannot change future events directly because they have not yet happened. You must change them indirectly by changing past events. However, past events have already happened, so they cannot be changed, meaning that the future cannot be changed. In other words, you have to wait for a future event to happen before you can attempt to change it; however, by then, it will be too late to change it because it has already happened. The future is predetermined. The choices that you make when you are presented with multiple options are also

predetermined. To claim that for every choice made, one could have acted differently implies that the thoughts and feelings that led to their actual choice could have been different. However, if we only exist in the past, then so do they, and likewise, they can only be changed before they arrive by changing their causes that have already occurred in the past, which is impossible. As William Shakespeare wisely stated, we are all akin to actors playing their roles in a movie. Reality is a movie, and our job is to keep the show running. Absolutely everything that happens is “scripted”. Everything that happens is supposed to happen. Everyone has a script, and they have to follow it. We have no other choice. All the so-called “ev/il” people are not ev/il. There is no ev/il. They simply follow their scripts. Every thi/ef, li/ar, ki/ller, ra/pist, ty/rant, chi/ld mol/ester, bu/lly, and others did not commit so-called “ev/il”. They were doing what you and everyone else are doing right now at this very moment. They followed their scripts, as everyone else does and must do. The victims of these acts follow their scripts as well.

The Nazis followed their scripts when they ki/lled the Jews. The Hutus followed their scripts when they ki/lled the Tutsis. White South Africans followed their scripts when they implemented apar/theid. Communist China followed its script when it let millions star/ve to de/ath. Europeans followed their scripts when they carried out colon/ialism. White Americans followed their scripts when they implemented sla/very. Every dictator and corrupt government follows its script when it dest/roys its country. Every gang follows its script when it terr/orizes its community. Al-Qaeda followed its script when it att/acked the USA. Everything that happens to you is part of your script. You des/erve everything that happens to you. Every child who is mol/ested deserves it. Every child who is abu/sed deserves it. Everyone who is ra/ped deserves it. Everyone who is ki/lled deserves it. Everyone who is poor des/erves it. Everyone who is disabled des/erves it. Everyone who is cheated des/erves it. Everyone who is deceived des/erves it. Everyone who is depressed des/erves it. To play the game of life, players must follow the rules just like in any other game. They must have a script that they follow absolutely, without fail. The simple reason is as previously stated. If we did not have scripts, none of us would even be here. The laws that govern reality orchestrate it so that reality can exist logically without unacceptable errors.

To think that you are so special, that reality itself supposedly cares about your well-being, is a silly idea that can only be the product of a delusional mind. The concept of morality is, in the end, an incoherent, primitive, naïve, and utterly

insane fantasy.

CHAPTER 3

SIMULATION THEORY

The simulation hypothesis proposes that all existence is a simulated reality. If this is possible, it potentially undermines the validity of everything written thus far. How can we be sure that we are in base reality (the real world)? If we are not, how can we be sure that our laws of physics are the same as those in base reality? Has something really always existed and might morality actually exist? I will argue that simulation theory is illogical and that it presents no problems to the aforementioned conclusions.

First, we need to have a basic understanding of how the human brain works. It has two modes of operation: the subconscious and conscious minds. The subconscious mind is responsible for all brain processes beyond your conscious control. These are all complex functions that keep you alive, for example, food digestion, waste production, body temperature regulation, and more. This accounts for most brain activities. Body functions are specific tasks that follow a specific order; thus, the subconscious mind is analogous to a programmable computer running a program based on a code. The conscious mind is responsible for all brain processes that are within your conscious control, for example, walking, talking, and so on. Control is in the form of thinking. You think about doing it before you do it. Thinking involves analyzing received data either by recalling stored data and looking for familiar patterns or by trying to see new patterns to make a judgment about the data. Thinking allows us to reprogram the subconscious to some extent, for example, to form new habits, new memories (of which there can be no learning without) and so on. The conscious mind also produces a phenomenon known as consciousness. Consciousness is an emergent property. It is knowledge. It is simply a logical conclusion from the act of thinking.

"I think, therefore I am."

René Descartes

If I can think, that means that I must exist; otherwise, how am I able to think? How could a non-existent thing think, let alone do anything? I think, therefore I exist. The absence of thought does not mean the absence of consciousness. Conclusions derived from thoughts (especially if they are obvious) become

memories, which are information stored in the brain. One does not constantly have to deduce that they must be conscious if they are thinking because it is an obvious fact that they already know. The de/ath of the brain ends all thought and all knowledge, leading to the end of consciousness. Who you really are, which is the “I” or the self, exists. It is consciousness. What you are fundamentally is your consciousness (mind). There exists a duality of mind and body. Consciousness is a continuous awareness, and it must be continuous, otherwise you will d/ie. For us to say that you are the same person, that you were from yesterday, your conscious awareness must have continued uninterrupted, since yesterday. If a body completely loses consciousness for even a split second and manages to regain it somehow, then you, who is conscious now, are quite literally a new person. The previous person was not you. They are de/ad. It does not matter that you still have memories from before the brain went unconscious. These memories actually belong to the previous consciousness (person) that inhabited the body that your consciousness inhabits now. It does not matter that your body is still the same as before the brain went unconscious because you are your mind, not your body. The body is merely a vehicle for the mind, and in this case, it has switched operators. This proves that reincarnation is fantasy. You can only be reborn as a new living thing if your consciousness has an uninterrupted transfer from the body that it currently inhabits to a new one. If the brain that generates you (your consciousness) d/ies, then your conscious awareness is interrupted because the moment that your brain stops working, it stops generating you. This means that, of the new brains that are born after yours has d/ied, none of the minds within them is yours. You d/ied, when your brain d/ied.

The brain sits imprisoned inside the skull and thus cannot interact with the environment outside the skull directly. It relies on the conversion of raw data, for example sound (analogous to analogue data), being received, for example, through the senses, into a form that it can interpret, for example, electric impulses (analogous to digital data). With this data, the brain can build a model of reality in real time. This becomes its umwelt (its experience of the world). Different brains in the same environment can have different umwelten; for example, human eyes can only detect visible light, whereas butterfly eyes can detect both visible and ultraviolet light. The more data the brain can receive, the greater its umwelt.

To analyze the simulation theory, let us consider a thought experiment. Imagine

someone with a perfectly healthy brain is asleep, while a scientist kidnaps them and take them to his lab. While they are still asleep and thus unaware of what is going on, the scientist surgically removes their brain and submerges it in a vat filled with a liquid that preserves their brain and supplies it with nutrients to keep it alive. In the room, there is a computer with electric cables that extend into the liquid inside the vat. The ends of the cables have electrodes near the brain. The computer can send electric signals that carry sensory information through the cables and electrodes, into the parts of the brain that process this data. The brain creates a model of reality using this data. A world with sights, sounds, textures, smells, and tastes. The data from the computer is purposefully deceitful in that it creates a world inside the brain that is completely different from the one outside it. The brain imagines itself waking up in its bed, in its usual body, and goes about its day without any suspicion, totally unaware that it now lives in a virtual world. This experiment leads the scientist to a disturbing conclusion. He too cannot be sure about the reality of the perception of the world in his own brain. What if he is also just a brain in a vat?

However, the scientist need not worry, at least not about whether he lives in the real world. Both the brain in the vat and his own brain, regardless of whether it is also in a vat, are not experiencing a “fake” world. The flaw in simulation theory is the idea that a second reality can exist within the original base reality. A reality cannot exist completely surrounded by another reality. Everything that exists is in base reality. If we take an empty bottle and close it shut with a lid, it now acts as a solid boundary between the space inside and the space outside. Does this mean that the inside of the bottle is a different “world”? No. If we open it, fill it with water, and then close it again, does it now contain “virtual” water? Technically, it does, in the sense that it is completely contained, similar to how a virtual reality is also completely contained inside a computer. Are the laws of physics that govern base reality unable to govern the behavior of the water in the bottle? No. The earlier claim that the closed bottle forms a solid boundary between the world inside it and the world outside it is false. All physical objects must occupy space. The matter that makes up the bottle and the lid must also occupy space. That space is in base reality. There is no boundary. The water is also in base reality. Everything that occupies space within base reality is in base reality. Imagine two points, A and B, that are not in contact with each other. If we can imagine a straight line that connects both points, this means that they are both in the same reality. We can imagine a straight line connecting the water in the bottle to an observer outside the bottle, meaning that

both the water and the observer are in the same reality. The only way that points A and B can be in different realities is if it is impossible to imagine a line that connects them both, such that the only way an imaginary object could move from point A to B is through teleportation, meaning that the object would have to disappear from the reality that contains point A and reappear in the reality that contains point B. In the aforementioned thought experiment, the brain in the vat is analogous to the bottle. The electric signals inside it are analogous to the water. The perception in the brain that results from these signals is in base reality. There is another common misconception that something can exist but supposedly still not be real, for example, the concept of Santa Claus and unicorns. Anything in base reality is by definition real. Santa Claus may not exist as a real person, but he does "exist" in the real ink used to draw him in the real pages of real books. He exists in the real pixels that appear on the real screens of real video viewing devices. He exists in your real brain, in your real imagination, from your real thoughts, and from the real information processed by your real neurons. Santa Claus is, in that sense, real, and so are the perceptions of the brain in the vat and the ones in your brain, whether you are awake or dreaming. The world inside your brain is as real as the world outside it. Simulation theory states that base reality is the real world while the simulated reality is not real, which is false. Anything in base reality (it does not matter in what form) is real. The laws of physics that govern base reality work the same both outside and inside your brain.

Can brains existing in a computer-generated simulation each have their own distinct experience of consciousness? No. Everything simulated by a computer cannot exist independently of it. If the computer is turned off or destroyed, the simulation ends. This means that everything that is simulated belongs to the computer. This includes the simulated brains and simulated thoughts inside those brains. Since thoughts are the source of consciousness, only the computer can be conscious because it is the owner of all thoughts inside the simulation. If multiple computers jointly run the simulation, for example, in an online multiplayer game, the only entities that can be conscious inside the simulation are still those computers. This is in contrast to the brain in the vat. The brain exists independently of the vat and the computer; therefore, the model of the world that it constructs inside it and its thoughts belong to it and not the vat or the computer. In the end, whether it is a simulation in a computer or a perception of reality in the brain, these are just the contents of a container, like water in a bottle. Everything that exists does so in base reality and is bound by the laws of

physics that govern it. Everything that exists, regardless of its nature, is real. The effectiveness of mathematics in the natural sciences is reasonable because where there is existence, there is logic, and mathematics is the most abstract application of the laws of logic.

CHAPTER 4

A FINAL SOLUTION

Existentialism is a philosophy that explores the issue of human existence. It explores questions related to the meaning, purpose, and value of human existence. Existential antinatalism and existential promortalism do not apply only to humans but also to all living things. Existentialist philosophers generally accept the concept of existential nihilism. This is the view that there is no meaning, purpose, or value to life; however, this is false. The view that the meaning of life has to be a specific goal within all possible goals that we should try to achieve, whether in a religious or secular sense, is illogical because it is based on the fanciful concept of morality. The belief in morality leads to the derivation of meaning from setting goals to perform the actions that are thought to be “good” or “bad”. Consider the example that religious people believe that the meaning of life is to follow the teachings of God, because that is what their religious texts describe as “good”, while a mass sh/ooter might decide for themselves that hurting as many people as possible is what gives them meaning, because they want to be “evil” since they think that pain is “bad”. A utilitarian might strive to make everybody happy because they think that happiness is “good”. Existential nihilists have the same flawed understanding of the concept of meaning. They think that nothing that we do matters; however, this is the opposite of the truth. Instead, literally anything and everything that we do matters. In one of the previous chapters about morality, we saw how everyone has a crucial role to play as an actor who follows their script and thus ensures the continued existence of reality. Every living and non-living thing (assuming that they are finite in number) is like a single gear in a gear train, where the entire train represents reality. The train only moves if the gears turn in the right direction and at the right speed. Every single gear is important. If even one of them refuses to move, the movement of the entire train halts. That is the meaning of life. The purpose of all things that exist, whether living or non-living, is to obey the laws of physics, while the purpose of the laws of physics is to govern the behavior of living and non-living objects. The existence of this objective meaning completely invalidates existential nihilism, and by extension, all existentialist philosophies that seek to provide solutions on how to deal with existential nihilism, because they are trying to solve a problem that does not exist. However, while existential antinatalism and existential promortalism state that life does indeed have objective meaning, they also suggest that it is **logical**

to reject this meaning. It is sensible not to begin new acting roles by making new living things and to bring one's own acting role and the acting roles of others to an e/nd through the permanent, complete dest/ruction of consciousness (de/ath). There are three reasons for this. The argument from unnecessary complexity, the argument from a lack of purpose, and the argument from a universal solution.

The argument from unnecessary complexity is based on the fact that non-living things, as stated previously, also perform scripted behavior for the same reason that we do. It states that if all living things disappeared, reality would still exist, comprising only non-living things. In this way, the creation of new living things and the prot/ection of already existing living things make reality unnecessarily more complex than it should be. It is analogous to two people deciding to help each other carry a bag that they initially believe is very heavy. However, upon lifting it, they realize that it is light enough so that one of them can carry it on their own. They can still continue to carry it together although this would obviously be silly. It is more logical for one of them to let go and leave the job to the other. If we remove some gears from the aforementioned gear train and mesh together the remaining ones, the train still can move without difficulty. Similarly, it is more logical to le/ave the job of following scripts to non-living objects because they can keep reality existing without us.

The argument from a lack of purpose states that all claims that try to argue that a living thing **must** continue li/ving cannot be proven. This is because these are moral claims, and therefore, any attempts to justify them end in an infinite regress of "ought" statements. This means that no one has an obligation to continue li/ving. It is not sensible to do something that you do not **have** to do, meaning that it is not sensible for anyone to continue li/ving because they do not **have** to. This also implies that procreation is illogical, because if something is not worth prese/rving, it logically follows that it is also not worth creating in the first place. However, does this not imply that all living things **have** to d/ie? Such a moral claim should also be impossible to prove, which would make this a self-refuting argument. This is false. This moral claim is invalid because it treats non-existent things as if they exist. It implies that once a thing stops existing, it has something to either lose or gain from being non-existent. This makes no sense since a non-existent thing can neither do anything nor have anything done to it. All living things do not **have** to d/ie. However, this does not mean that being de/ad is not sensible, even though it is not sensible to do something that you do not **have** to do. This is because a non-existent thing cannot be judged as

being either logical or not because it does not exist. The fact that all living things do not **have** to continue li/ving is enough to render procreation and the prot/ection of already existing life illogical.

The argument from a universal solution can be summarized with the phrase “Know life, know problems. No life, no problems”. It states that, whatever problems are currently faced by living things, they can be solved by one universally applicable solution, namely, de/ath. De/ath not only solves their current problems, but it also spares them from having to deal with new problems; hence, de/ath is a final solution. Note that the word “problem” here is not used in the context of a matter or situation that is unwanted. Instead, it is used in a general context to simply mean a **desire**. To have a desire means to want something. The nature of the desire is irrelevant. It can be as big as wanting to land a man on the moon or as simple as needing to go and use the toilet. D/ying is the most logical reaction to having any and all desires because it eliminates the desires themselves. It strikes at the heart of the problem, while abstaining from breeding prevents the creation of desires in new living things. Consider, for example, the fact that in order for humans to survive, they need to breathe constantly. Rather than fulfilling the need to breathe by breathing, it is more sensible to e/nd your life so that you never need to breathe again. When you remain childless, potential new people are spared from engaging in this stupid activity. Breathing is, of course, the bare minimum. Most people need water, food, clothing, shelter, security, health care, education, love, entertainment, happiness, and money. Once all the desires add up, we can get a full picture of the true insanity of the modern world, which, due to its high level of technological advancement, is aimed at wasting large amounts of time and effort to satisfy our desires. This stands as a testament to our immense, collective stupidity. We falsely assume by default that the prot/ection of human life is a necessity. It is upon this lie that all so-called “great civilizations” are built.

Ki/lling yourself will solve your problems, but what if it creates new problems for those who remain? You might have children, other family members and friends who might be devastated and in need of financial help for funeral costs and raising your children. In other words, they have the **desire** that you were still alive. Since they have a desire, they can most logically deal with it by ki/lling themselves too. Those who are unable to ki/ll themselves, for example babies, the disabled, or the elderly, can be assisted by being ki/lled by others. Those who are unwilling to ki/ll themselves can still be ki/lled against their will. Con/sent is

not required because it is an illogical concept that is based on the illogical concept of morality. If possible, you could ki/ll them all first or convince them to ki/ll themselves, before you ki/ll yourself next. What if childlessness creates new problems for people who currently exist? As an example, a steep decline in birth rates globally can cause many serious economic and social problems for living people. This implies that living people **desire** economic and social prosperity. Because they have desires, they can most logically deal with them through mass sui/ci/de, gen/oci/de, or both. Rather than gen/oci/de, we can commit omn/ici/de to also spare non-human living things from senseless breeding and other desires. What if you want to continue to live? What if you want to have the desire to continue to live? What if you have the desire to have desires? Each of these is a desire, so it represents a need that requires fulfillment. It is still more logical to d/ie so that you do not need to satisfy any needs. What if you have no desires? That is impossible. All living things have desires. All living things think, and every thought is either an expression of a desire or the fulfillment of a desire. What if everyone, apart from you, is a philosophical zombie? You have no way of knowing if they are or not. It is logical to k/ill them anyway, based on the possibility that they might have consciousness. The rem/oval of life is thus, the elimination of needs because the de/ad need nothing; hence, the saying, “Rest in peace” for it is only in de/ath that one can find true peace.

There is no difference between the unborn and the de/ad because they both exist in a state of non-existence, where they both have no desires. It should be noted that this is meant as a metaphor, because the unborn and the de/ad, obviously do not exist at all. Since the unborn do not need or want anything, it is illogical to give them life so that they begin to have desires. Because of this inherently illogical aspect of birth and because being unborn is the same as being de/ad, it logically follows that once one is born, it is logical for them to d/ie as soon as possible. De/ath is a return to where they came from. A state of non-existence, where they did not need or want anything.

Antinatalism is only prevention. It cannot cure the li/ving of the error of their par/ents. They have only one hope: promortalism.